

APPLICANT(S): GLUKHOVSKY, Arkady et al.
SERIAL NO.: 10/695,847
FILED: October 30, 2003
Page 6

REMARKS

The present response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of objection and/or rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicants assert that the present invention is new, non-obvious and useful. Prompt consideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Status of Claims

Claims 1-33 are pending in the application, of which claims 5-7, 9, 11, 22-24, 26, 31 and 32 are withdrawn from consideration.

Claims 1-4, 8, 10, 12-21, 25, 27-30 and 33 have been rejected.

Claims 1-3, 10, 14, 17, 20, 25 and 27 have been amended.

Claims 4, 16, 21 and 33 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. In making this cancellation without prejudice, Applicants reserve all rights in these claims to file divisional and/or continuation patent applications.

Applicants respectfully assert that the amendments to the claims add no new matter.

The Telephone Interview

Initially, Applicants wish to thank Examiner Smith for granting and attending the telephone interview, with Applicants' Representative Guy Yonay, Registration No. 52,388, on January 3, 2007.

APPLICANT(S): GLUKHOVSKY, Arkady et al.
SERIAL NO.: 10/695,847
FILED: October 30, 2003
Page 7

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 8, 12-17, 20, 25 and 27-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a), as being anticipated by Gazdzinski (2001/0051766). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection in view of the remarks that follow.

Gazdzinski discloses that “When all data acquisition is complete, the probe is deactivated (such as by simply powering it down) in step 1522.” (paragraph [0208]). Therefore, Gazdzinski does not teach or suggest, inter alia, “said operation blocker is for preventing activation of said device after a specified threshold level is exceeded in a parameter from a list comprising: time of operation, voltage level of a power source, in-vivo Ph level, in-vivo pressure and number of image frames”, as recited in amended independent claim 1. For a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach all elements of the claim. Therefore, Gazdzinski cannot anticipate claim 1, as amended. Accordingly, amended independent claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2, 8, 12 and 13 depend from claim 1 and therefore include all the limitations of this claim. At least for this reason, claims 2, 8, 12 and 13 are likewise allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to amended independent claim 1 and to claims 2, 8, 12 and 13 dependent thereon.

Regarding claim 14, as amended, Gazdzinski does not teach or suggest, inter alia, “a non-volatile circuit to prevent reactivation of said device after said device has been used for a medical exam and after a specified threshold level is exceeded in a parameter from a list comprising: time of operation, voltage level of a power source, in-vivo Ph level, in-vivo pressure and number of image frames”, as recited in amended independent claim 14. For a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach all elements of the claim. Therefore, Gazdzinski cannot anticipate claim 14, as amended. Accordingly, amended independent claim 14 is allowable.

APPLICANT(S): GLUKHOVSKY, Arkady et al.
SERIAL NO.: 10/695,847
FILED: October 30, 2003
Page 8

Claim 15 depends from claim 14 and therefore includes all the limitations of this claim. At least for this reason, claim 15 is likewise allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to amended independent claim 14 and to claim 15 dependent thereon.

Claim 16 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Regarding claim 17, as amended, Gazdzinski does not teach or suggest, inter alia, “activating a permanent operation blocker in said device after a specified threshold level is exceeded in a parameter from a list comprising: time of operation, voltage level of a power source, in-vivo Ph level, in-vivo pressure and number of image frames”, as recited in amended independent claim 17. For a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach all elements of the claim. Therefore, Gazdzinski cannot anticipate claim 17, as amended. Accordingly, amended independent claim 17 is allowable. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to amended independent claim 17.

Regarding claim 20, as amended, Gazdzinski does not teach or suggest, inter alia, “a circuit to block activation of the device after a specified threshold level is exceeded in a parameter from a list comprising: time of operation, voltage level of a power source, in-vivo Ph level, in-vivo pressure and number of image frames”, as recited in amended independent claim 20. For a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach all elements of the claim. Therefore, Gazdzinski cannot anticipate claim 20, as amended. Accordingly, amended independent claim 20 is allowable.

Claim 25 depends from claim 20 and therefore includes all the limitations of this claim. At least for this reason, claim 25 is likewise allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to amended independent claim 20 and to claim 25 dependent thereon.

APPLICANT(S): GLUKHOVSKY, Arkady et al.
SERIAL NO.: 10/695,847
FILED: October 30, 2003
Page 9

Regarding claim 27, as amended, Gazdzinski does not teach or suggest, inter alia, “permanently preventing the operation of said autonomous in-vivo sensing device after a specified threshold level is exceeded in a parameter from a list comprising: time of operation, voltage level of a power source, in-vivo Ph level, in-vivo pressure and number of image frames”, as recited in amended independent claim 27. For a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach all elements of the claim. Therefore, Gazdzinski cannot anticipate claim 27, as amended. Accordingly, amended independent claim 27 is allowable.

Claims 28-30 depend from claim 27 and therefore include all the limitations of this claim. At least for this reason, claims 28-30 are likewise allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to amended independent claim 27 and to claims 28-30 dependent thereon.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 17 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being anticipated by Kane (6,204,746). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection in view of the remarks that follow.

Kane discloses “A thermal overload mechanism for providing protection to tip and ring conductors in a telecommunications system in the event of a power cross occurrence of telephone lines with power lines” (Abstract). Kane does not teach or suggest, inter alia, “activating a permanent operation blocker in said device after a specified threshold level is exceeded in a parameter from a list comprising: time of operation, voltage level of a power source, in-vivo Ph level, in-vivo pressure and number of image frames”, as recited in amended independent claim 17. For a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach all elements of the claim. Therefore, Kane cannot anticipate claim 17, as amended. Accordingly, amended independent claim 17 is allowable.

Claim 19 depends from claim 17 and therefore includes all the limitations of this claim. At least for this reason, claim 19 is likewise allowable. Accordingly, Applicants

APPLICANT(S): GLUKHOVSKY, Arkady et al.
SERIAL NO.: 10/695,847
FILED: October 30, 2003
Page 10

respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to amended independent claim 17 and to claim 19 dependent thereon.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 3-4, 18, 21 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Gazdzinski in view of Denen (5,400,267).

Independent claims 1 and 17 are allowable over Gazdzinski in view of Denen from the reasons described above. Claims 3 and 18 depend from claims 1 and 17 respectively, and therefore include all the limitations of those claims. At least for this reason, claims 3 and 18 are likewise allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to claims 3 and 18.

Claims 4, 21 and 33 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Gazdzinski in view of Kane.

Independent claim 17 is allowable over Gazdzinski in view of Kane from the reasons described above. Claim 19 depend from claim 17 respectively, and therefore include all the limitations of this claim. At least for this reason, claim 19 is likewise allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to claim 19.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the pending claims are deemed to be allowable. Their favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner have any question or comment as to the form, content or entry of this Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below. Similarly, if there are any further issues yet to be resolved to advance the prosecution of this application to issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned counsel.

APPLICANT(S): GLUKHOVSKY, Arkady et al.
SERIAL NO.: 10/695,847
FILED: October 30, 2003
Page 11

Please charge any fees associated with this paper to deposit account No. 50-3355.

Respectfully submitted,



Guy Yonay
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 52,388

Dated: January 11, 2007

Pearl Cohen Zedek Latzer, LLP
1500 Broadway, 12th Floor
New York, New York 10036
Tel: (646) 878-0800
Fax: (646) 878-0801